

with the auxiliary particle filter [1], [8], [16], but we continue to seek better approaches.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Arulampalam, S. Maskell, N. Gordon, and T. Clapp, "A tutorial on particle filters for online nonlinear/non-Gaussian Bayesian tracking," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 174–188, Feb. 2002.
- [2] Y. Bar-Shalom, X. Li, and T. Kirubarajan, *Estimation With Application to Tracking and Navigation*. New York: Wiley, 2001.
- [3] M. Basseville and L. Nikiforov, *Detection of Abrupt Changes: Theory and Applications*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1993.
- [4] W. D. Blair and M. Brandt-Pearce, "Statistical description of monopulse parameters for tracking Rayleigh targets," *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 597–611, Apr. 1998.
- [5] W. D. Blair and M. Brandt-Pearce, "Unresolved Rayleigh target detection using monopulse measurements," *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 543–552, Apr. 1998.
- [6] W. D. Blair and M. Brandt-Pearce, "Monopulse DOA estimation of two unresolved Rayleigh targets," *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 452–469, Apr. 2001.
- [7] Y. Boers and H. Driessen, "A particle-filter-based detection scheme," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 10, no. 10, pp. 300–302, Oct. 2003.
- [8] O. Cappé, E. Moulines, and T. Ryden, *Inference in Hidden Markov Models*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 2005.
- [9] A. Doucet, N. Freitas, and N. Gordon, *Sequential Monte Carlo Methods in Practice*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 2001.
- [10] N. Gordon, D. Salmond, and A. Smith, "Novel approach to Bayesian nonlinear nonGaussian state estimation," *Proc. Inst. Elect. Eng.—F*, vol. 140, no. 2, pp. 107–113, Apr. 1993.
- [11] A. Isaac, X. Zhang, P. Willett, and Y. Bar-Shalom, "A particle filter for tracking two closely spaced objects using monopulse radar channel signals," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 357–360, Jun. 2006.
- [12] A. Kong, J. Liu, and W. Wong, "Sequential imputations and Bayesian missing data problems," *J. Amer. Stat. Assoc.*, vol. 89, pp. 278–288, 1994.
- [13] N. Levanon, *Radar Principles*. New York: Wiley, 1988.
- [14] G. Lorden, "Procedures for reacting to a change in distribution," *Ann. Math. Stat.*, vol. 42, pp. 1897–1908, 1971.
- [15] E. Page, "Continuous inspection schemes," *Biometrika*, vol. 41, pp. 100–115, Jan. 1954.
- [16] M. Pitt and N. Shephard, "Filtering via simulation: Auxiliary particle filters," *J. Amer. Stat. Assoc.*, vol. 94, pp. 590–599, Jun. 1999.
- [17] A. Sinha and Y. Bar-Shalom, "Maximum likelihood angle extractor of two closely spaced targets," *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 183–203, Jan. 2002.
- [18] Z. Wang, A. Sinha, P. Willett, and Y. Bar-Shalom, "Angle estimation for two unresolved targets with monopulse radar," *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 998–1019, Jul. 2004.
- [19] P. Willett, W. Blair, and T. Ogle, "Multitarget tracking and monopulse signal processing for spawning targets," presented at the 2003 SPIE Aerospace Conf. Signal Data Processing of Small Targets, Orlando, FL, Apr. 2004.
- [20] X. Zhang, P. Willett, and Y. Bar-Shalom, "Monopulse radar detection and localization of multiple unresolved targets via joint bin processing," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 1225–1236, Apr. 2005.

## Comments on "Performance Analysis of a Deterministic Channel Estimator for Block Transmission Systems With Null Guard Intervals"

Borching Su, *Student Member, IEEE*, and  
P. P. Vaidyanathan, *Fellow, IEEE*

**Abstract**—In the above-mentioned paper, a Cramér–Rao bound was derived for the performance of a blind channel estimation algorithm. In this correspondence, an error in the bound is pointed out and corrected. It is observed here that the performance of the said algorithm does not achieve the Cramér–Rao bound.

**Index Terms**—Blind channel estimation, Cramér–Rao bound (CRB), trailing zeros.

In the above paper [1], important work has been done to analyze the algorithm in [2] which solves a blind channel estimation problem. The performance of the algorithm in [2] in the high-SNR region was shown to be as in [1, eq. (33)]. The Cramér–Rao bound (CRB) of the above-mentioned blind estimation problem was shown to be as in [1, eq. (49)]. The coincidence of (33) and (49) led the authors of [1] to claim that the algorithm in [2] is statistically efficient (i.e., achieves the CRB) at high SNR values. However, we have found an error in the derivation of (49), which invalidates this claim. Equation (49) of [1] was derived from (80) in [1, App. B]. The second equality of (80) is not valid in general since it is conditioned on the validity of the matrix identity

$$(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}^H)^{-1} = \mathbf{A}^{H\dagger}\mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{A}^\dagger \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{A}$  is a full rank matrix with more columns than rows and  $\mathbf{B}$  is a square positive-definite matrix. But a simple example shows that this identity is not true in general: set

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

then the left-hand side of (1) is  $\mathbf{I}_2$ , whereas the right-hand side is  $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$ .

A correction to the CRB, however, is easy to make. The corrected CRB can be simply taken as the first equality of (80) of [1]:

$$\mathbf{C}_{\text{CR}} = \sigma_v^2 \left[ \tilde{\mathbf{V}}[\mathbf{I}_{L \times L} \otimes (\mathbf{F}^* \mathbf{S}_N^* \mathbf{S}_N^T \mathbf{F}^T)] \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^H \right]^{-1} \quad (2)$$

(in the original text [1],  $\sigma_v^2$  appeared in the denominator, which was presumably a typographical error).

We conduct numerical simulations to compare

$$\mathbf{C}_{hh} \approx \sigma_v^2 \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^{\dagger H} \left[ \mathbf{I}_{L \times L} \otimes \left( \mathbf{F}^{-T} (\mathbf{S}_N^* \mathbf{S}_N^T)^{-1} \mathbf{F}^{*-} \right) \right] \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^\dagger$$

from (33) of [1] and the corrected CRB in (2). The simulation setting basically follows that in [1]: the channel order is chosen as  $L = 4$ , and the channel coefficients are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.), zero-mean, unit variance complex Gaussian random variables.

Manuscript received March 20, 2007; revised June 24, 2007. The associate editor coordinating the review of this manuscript and approving it for publication was Prof. Philippe Loubaton. This work supported in parts by the NSF Grant CCF-0428326, ONR Grant N00014-06-1-0011, and the Moore Fellowship of the California Institute of Technology.

The authors are with the California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125 USA (e-mail: borching@caltech.edu).

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TSP.2007.907855

TABLE I  
COMPARISON OF [1, EQ. (33)] AND (2); THE DATA LENGTH  
PER BLOCK IS  $M = 12$

$N$	$\text{tr}(\mathbf{C}_{hh})/\sigma_v^2$	$\text{tr}(\mathbf{C}_{CR})/\sigma_v^2$	$\frac{\text{tr}(\mathbf{C}_{hh}) - \text{tr}(\mathbf{C}_{CR})}{\text{tr}(\mathbf{C}_{CR})}$
8	—	1.7752	—
12	184.01	1.3373	136.6002
14	6.8590	1.0981	5.2462
16	3.5362	0.9760	2.6233
20	1.7197	0.7414	1.3196
100	0.1614	0.1448	0.1147
1000	$1.5149 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.4986 \times 10^{-2}$	0.0109

The data length per block is  $M = 12$ , and the number of blocks  $N$  ranges from 8 to 1000. Elements of the data matrix  $\mathbf{S}_N$  were generated using the quadrature phase-shift-keying (QPSK) constellation and  $\mathbf{F}$  is chosen as  $\mathbf{I}_M$ . One hundred independent realizations of channel coefficients and ten independent realizations of data blocks  $\mathbf{S}_N$  are used (totally 1000 different pairs of  $\mathbf{S}_N$  and  $\mathbf{h}$ ). Traces of  $\mathbf{C}_{hh}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_{CR}$  in (2) are computed for these 1000 realizations and the averages are reported in Table I.

We find from Table I that there is a significant discrepancy between the corrected CRB in (2) and the performance of the algorithm in [2] [1, eq. (33)], especially when  $N$  is small. Furthermore, when  $N < M$ , the inverse of  $\mathbf{S}_N^* \mathbf{S}_N^T$  in [1, eq. (33)] does not exist, but  $\mathbf{C}_{CR}$  in (2) still gives a finite value. This suggests there might exist algorithms (e.g., see [4]–[6]) other than [2] that solve the aforementioned blind estimation problem when  $N < M$ . On the other hand, when  $N$  is large, the difference between traces of  $\mathbf{C}_{hh}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_{CR}$  tends to shrink, but it never goes to zero. This observation is accounted for by the following lemma, where we use notations from the singular value decomposition of the  $L \times LM$  full-rank matrix  $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}$ :

$$\tilde{\mathbf{V}} = \mathbf{U} [\mathbf{D} \quad \mathbf{0}] [\mathbf{V}_1 \quad \mathbf{V}_2]^H \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbf{U}$  is a unitary matrix,  $\mathbf{D}$  is a diagonal matrix with positive diagonal entries, and  $\mathbf{V} := [\mathbf{V}_1 \quad \mathbf{V}_2]$  is a unitary matrix.  $\mathbf{V}_1$  and  $\mathbf{V}_2$  are the first  $L$  and the last  $(M-1)L$  columns of  $\mathbf{V}$ , respectively.

**Lemma 1:** If  $N \geq M$ , then  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{C}_{hh}) \geq \text{tr}(\mathbf{C}_{CR})$ , with equality if and only if

$$\mathbf{V}_1^H \mathbf{B} \mathbf{V}_2 = \mathbf{0} \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbf{B} := \mathbf{I}_{L \times L} \otimes (\mathbf{F}^* \mathbf{S}_N^* \mathbf{S}_N^T \mathbf{F})$  and  $\mathbf{V}_1$  and  $\mathbf{V}_2$  are defined as in (3).

*Proof:* Since both  $\mathbf{C}_{hh}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_{CR}$  are positive definite (p.d.), the statement  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{C}_{hh}) \geq \text{tr}(\mathbf{C}_{CR})$  is equivalent to the statement that  $\mathbf{C}_{hh} - \mathbf{C}_{CR}$  is a positive-semidefinite matrix. We first observe that  $\mathbf{B}$  is p.d., since  $\mathbf{F}^* \mathbf{S}_N^* \mathbf{S}_N^T \mathbf{F}$  is p.d., Recall the SVD of  $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}$  as in (3), where  $\mathbf{U}$  and  $\mathbf{V} := [\mathbf{V}_1 \quad \mathbf{V}_2]$  are unitary matrices and  $\mathbf{D}$  is a diagonal matrix with positive diagonal entries. Define  $\mathbf{B}_2 := \mathbf{V}^H \mathbf{B} \mathbf{V}$  which is obviously also p.d., Partition  $\mathbf{B}_2$  and  $\mathbf{B}_2^{-1}$  into

$$\mathbf{B}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{B}_{11} & \mathbf{B}_{12} \\ \mathbf{B}_{12}^H & \mathbf{B}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \mathbf{B}_2^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{B}'_{11} & \mathbf{B}'_{12} \\ \mathbf{B}'_{12}^H & \mathbf{B}'_{22} \end{bmatrix},$$

respectively, so that  $\mathbf{B}_{11}$  and  $\mathbf{B}'_{11}$  have the same size as  $\mathbf{D}(L \times L)$ . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}_{CR} &= \sigma_v^2 (\tilde{\mathbf{V}} \mathbf{B} \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^H)^{-1} = \sigma_v^2 \mathbf{U} ([\mathbf{D} \quad \mathbf{0}] \mathbf{B}_2 [\mathbf{D} \quad \mathbf{0}]^T)^{-1} \mathbf{U}^H \\ &= \sigma_v^2 \mathbf{U} \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{B}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{U}^H \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}_{hh} &= \sigma_v^2 \tilde{\mathbf{V}}^\dagger \mathbf{B}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{V}} = \sigma_v^2 \mathbf{U} [\mathbf{D}^{-1} \quad \mathbf{0}] \mathbf{B}_2^{-1} [\mathbf{D}^{-1} \quad \mathbf{0}]^T \mathbf{U}^H \\ &= \sigma_v^2 \mathbf{U} \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{B}'_{11} \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{U}^H. \end{aligned}$$

So  $\mathbf{C}_{CR} \leq \mathbf{C}_{hh}$  if and only if

$$\mathbf{B}_{11}^{-1} \leq \mathbf{B}'_{11} = \mathbf{B}_{11}^{-1} + \mathbf{B}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{B}_{12} \mathbf{\Delta}_{B11}^{-1} \mathbf{B}_{12}^H \mathbf{B}_{11}^{-1}$$

where  $\mathbf{\Delta}_{B11} := \mathbf{B}_{22} - \mathbf{B}_{12}^H \mathbf{B}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{B}_{12}$  is the Schur complement [3] of  $\mathbf{B}_{11}$  in  $\mathbf{B}_2$ . Since  $\mathbf{B}_2$  is p.d., both  $\mathbf{B}_{11}$  and  $\mathbf{\Delta}_{B11}$  are also p.d., (see [3, Theorem (7.7.6)]). So  $\mathbf{B}_{11}^{-1} \leq \mathbf{B}'_{11}$  is readily verified, with equality if and only if  $\mathbf{B}_{12} = \mathbf{0}$ , which is equivalent to (4). ■

Using Lemma 1, we find that [1, eq. (33)] achieves the CRB if and only if (4) is satisfied. Equation (4) can be satisfied only in one of two possible ways described as follows.

- If  $\mathbf{B}$  is the identity matrix or a positive multiple thereof, i.e.,  $\mathbf{S}_N^* \mathbf{S}_N^T = c \mathbf{I}_M$  for some positive constant  $c$ , then (4) is satisfied. This is extremely unlikely to happen since elements of  $\mathbf{S}_N$  are i.i.d. random symbols. However, we should note that  $(1/N) \mathbf{S}_N^* \mathbf{S}_N^T$  tends to approach  $c \mathbf{I}_M$  for some  $c > 0$  as  $N$  goes to infinity. This explains to some extent why the discrepancy between  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{C}_{hh})$  and  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{C}_{CR})$  approaches zero as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .
- On the other hand, if  $\mathbf{B} \neq c \mathbf{I}$ , then columns of  $\mathbf{V}_1$  and  $\mathbf{V}_2$  must match the eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{B}$  in order to make (4) true. But this is also extremely unlikely since  $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}$  depends on, besides  $\mathbf{S}_N$ , the random channel coefficients, which we have no control of.

In conclusion, the gap existing between [1, eq. (33)] and the corrected CRB (2) suggests that there might exist algorithms other than [2] that yield a better performance than [2] in the high-SNR region. Indeed, there are such algorithms, as reported in [4]–[6].

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. Barbarossa, A. Scaglione, and G. B. Giannakis, "Performance analysis of a deterministic channel estimator for block transmission systems with null guard intervals," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 684–695, Mar. 2002.
- [2] A. Scaglione, G. B. Giannakis, and S. Barbarossa, "Redundant filter bank precoders and equalizers Part II: Synchronization and direct equalization," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 47, no. 7, pp. 2007–2022, Jul. 1999.
- [3] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996.
- [4] D. H. Pham and J. H. Manton, "A subspace algorithm for guard interval based channel identification and source recovery requiring just two received blocks," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Acoustics, Speech, Signal Process. (ICASSP) 2003*, Hong Kong, China, pp. 317–320.
- [5] B. Su and P. P. Vaidyanathan, "A generalized algorithm for blind channel identification with linearly redundant precoding," *EURASIP J. Adv. Signal Process.*, vol. 2007, p. 13, 2007, Article ID 25672.
- [6] B. Su and P. P. Vaidyanathan, "Performance analysis of generalized zero-padded blind channel estimation algorithms," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 14, no. 11, pp. 789–792, Dec. 2007.